UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/535,016	10/31/2005	Harri Friberg	516/9	9087
27538 7590 05/16/2008 KAPLAN GILMAN GIBSON & DERNIER L.L.P. 900 ROUTE 9 NORTH WOODBRIDGE NI 07005			EXAMINER	
			DOUGLAS, STEVEN O	
WOODBRIDGE, NJ 07095			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3771	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			05/16/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)					
Office Action Occurrence	10/535,016	FRIBERG ET AL.					
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit					
	/Steven O. Douglas/	3771					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply							
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).							
Status							
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>20 M</u>	arch 2008.						
	action is non-final.						
<i>;</i> —	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is						
•	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposition of Claims							
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1 and 3-12</u> is/are pending in the application.							
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.							
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.							
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1 and 3-12</u> is/are rejected.							
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.							
· · · · — · ·	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·						
Application Papers							
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine	r.						
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.							
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).							
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).							
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.							
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119							
12)⊠ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).							
a)⊠ All b)□ Some * c)□ None of:							
, ,	1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.						
	_						
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage							
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).							
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.							
Attachment(s)							
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)							
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Paper No(s)/Mail Date							
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  Paper No(s)/Mail Date  5) Notice of Informal Patent Application  6) Other:							
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6) Other:							

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, and 3-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bird (USPat.4,080,103) in view of Thompson (US Pat. 3,301,255), Richardson (US Pat. 5,752,506) and Garoutte (US Pat. 5,222,489).

The Bird reference discloses a portable air compressor system for providing a flow of respirator air comprising a plurality of compressors (16,17,18), a cooling device (see cooling coil 46), and a water separator 54, but fails to disclose a tube or nozzle portion including a tapered passage. The Thompson, Richardson and Garoutte references collectively show that tapered tubes or nozzle portions are well known and take various forms (claim 3) in respirator arts for various reasons (see Fig. 5 in Thompson, see element 20 in Richardson, and Fig. 3 in Garoutte) such as achieving desired air flow characteristics such as pressure and volumetric flow rate. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Bird device to include a tube or nozzle portion with a tapered passage in view of the collective showing of the Thompson, Richardson and Garoutte references which establish that the use of such tapered tubes and nozzles is well known in the respirator arts in order to acheive air flow characteristics such as pressure and volumetric flow rate.

In regard to claims 4,10 and 11, the Bird reference further fails to disclose a second water separator. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include a second water separator, since it has been held mere duplication of essential working parts of a device involves only routine skill in the art. *St. Regis Paper Co. v. Bemis Co., 193 USPQ 8.* 

In regard to claim 5, the Bird reference further fails to disclose a second cooling device. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include a second cooling device, since it has been held mere duplication of essential working parts of a device involves only routine skill in the art. *St. Regis Paper Co. v. Bemis Co., 193 USPQ 8.* 

## Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 3/20/08 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. In regard to Applicant's argument that none of the prior art discloses separating water from a gas cooled in the tapering passage (i.e. placing a water separator after a tapered passage of a gas circuit, Examiner want's to direct to the water separator of Bird (see rejection above) and then to the collective teachings of the Thompson, Richardson and Garoutte references which show that tapered passages are well known in the art for various reasons to achieve desired flow characteristics. Furthermore, the cooling of a gas would be an inherent flow characteristic of a gas conveyed through a tapered passage in the Bird system.

In regard to Applicant's repeated argument that there doesn't exist a reason or motivation to combine the teachings of the Thompson, Richardson and Garoutte references with that of Bird, Examiner want's to reiterate that he has relied on the Thompson, Richardson and Garoutte

references to merely show that the use of tapered passages are conventionally known in the fluid arts and to employ tapered passages most anywhere in gas flow systems including a system such as Bird's would achieve a reasonable amount of predicted results.

## Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to /Steven O. Douglas/ whose telephone number is (571) 272-4885. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thurs 6:30-5:00.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/535,016 Page 5

Art Unit: 3771

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated

information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Steven O. Douglas/ Primary Examiner Art Unit 3771

SD 5/12/08